

EXHIBIT 18

248. It is my understanding that in IPR2020-00825 against the '266 patent, CoolIT has argued~~2. Patent Owner argues~~ that because the tabs 242 on plate 240 of the 2007 provisional application (Appl. No. 60/954,987 filed on August 9, 2007) '330 patent are bendable, the plate 240 is made of a compliant material. I disagree. First, the 2007 provisional '330 patent does not state that tabs 242 and plate 240 are made from the same material. While they could be made of the same material, they are not necessarily made of the same material. Thus, the bendability of tabs 242 does not provide any inherent disclosure that plate 240 can be a compliant body.

450. Third, the bendable tabs 242 would teach a person skilled in the art that tabs 242 and plate 240 are made of a stiff material (assuming they are made of the same material) rather than a compliant material. This is because the 2007 provisional discloses that the tabs are bent permanently over the ~~outei-most~~outermost microchannel walls during the manufacturing assembly process. See ~~Ex. 1005 [the 2007 publication]~~provisional at 14. A stiff material (e.g., steel, aluminum) will tend to undergo plastic (permanent) deformation due to its high modulus of elasticity, which means it will tend to maintain its bent shape when the applied force (stress) is released. In contrast, a compliant material (e.g., rubber, elastomer) will tend to undergo elastic (nonpermanent) deformation due to its low modulus of elasticity, which means it will tend to return to its original (e.g., unbent) shape when the applied stress is released. Therefore, the permanently bent tabs 242 would have indicated to a skilled artisan that the tabs (and by extension plate 240) are ~~made of a~~ stiff, rather than compliant, ~~material~~ so that tabs 242 would retain their bent shapes during the assembly process.